Date(s) of Assessment:	Project:
Assessor(s):	Review Examined:

		Y , N,	F,O	Comments
		NA		
REV	IEW PREPARATION			
1	Have standards been identified to			
	clearly define the review process?			
2	Were guidelines used to prepare for			
	the review?			
3	Has the project submitted any request			
	for deviations or waivers to the			
	defined process?			
4	Have entrance and exit criteria been			
	established for the review?			
5	Was an agenda prepared and			
	distributed in advance of the review?			
6	Was the review package provided			
	with ample time to review?			
7	Were the appropriate stakeholders in			
	attendance?			
REV	IEW CONTENT			
8	Were the goals of the review and any			
	review prerequisites provided?			
9	Was the review process addressed,			
	including the method for capturing			
	Requests for Action (RFAs), risks, or			
	issues?			
10	Was an overview of the software			
	project/system provided (e.g., mission			
	goals, key functionality, operational			
	characteristics)?			
11	Was an Organization/Work			
	Breakdown Structure (WBS) /Project			
	relationship presented?			
12	Were external dependencies defined?			

Revision: 2.0 Page 1 of 7

PDR (	OBJECTIVES		
13	Does the PDR reflect that all system requirements have been allocated?		
	If so, are they complete, and flow-		
	down to verify system performance?		
14	Does the PDR show that the design		
14	is verifiable and that all risks have		
	been identified, characterized, and		
	mitigation plans defined?		
15	Does the PDR include a complete		
13	and comprehensive presentation of		
	the entire design? Was the		
	presentation by means of block		
	diagrams, flow diagrams, signals		
	flow diagrams, interface circuits,		
	s/w logic flow, and timing		
	diagrams?		
16	Does the PDR show that the cost		
	estimates and schedules indicate that		
	the mission will be ready to launch		
	and operate on time and within		
	budget, and that control processes		
	are adequate to ensure remaining		
	within allocated resources?		
17	Does the PDR address a project		
	planning and tracking system to		
	ensure sufficient project monitoring		
	(i.e., earned value or a comparable		
	system)?		
REQU	UIREMENTS		
18	Were action items statused from the		
	Software Requirements Review		
	(SRR)?		
19	Did the review package include an		
	overview of changes, additions,		
	and/or deletions to the requirements		
	since SRR?		
20	Did the review package provide an		
	update on requirements for reuse of		
	existing software?		
21	Were performance and/or quality		
	requirements addressed?		

Revision: 2.0 Page 2 of 7

22	Has safety-critical software been	
22	1	
	identified and uniquely defined as requirements?	
23	Were security requirements	
23	addressed?	
24		
24	Was the software requirements	
	traceability matrix updated to reflect requirement changes?	
25	Was the software requirements	
23	traceability matrix updated to map	
	requirements to software	
	subsystems?	
26	Were "To Be Determined" (TBD)	
20	requirements addressed?	
ODEI	· •	
	RATIONAL SCENARIOS	
27	Have operational scenarios been	
	generated, one for each major	
•	product that is generated?	
28	Was the Fault Detection, Isolation,	
	& Recovery (FDIR) strategy	
	discussed?	
29	Were hazard reduction strategies	
	discussed?	
HIGH	I -LEVEL DESIGN	
30	Was the system architecture	
	presented?	
31	Were all interface descriptions	
	presented (both internal and	
	external)?	
32	Was the software architecture	
	presented?	
33	Were software subsystems or major	
	components defined?	
34	Were design drivers addressed?	
35	Were design alternatives and	
	tradeoffs addressed?	
36	Were current design status and	
	issues addressed?	
37	Were software size estimates	
	provided?	
38	Were budget and staffing numbers	
	provided?	1 1

Revision: 2.0 Page 3 of 7

TECL	HNICAL APPROACH	
39	Were resource estimates presented (e.g., Central Processing Unit (CPU), memory, databases, and data storage)?	
40	Was the error handling and recovery strategy presented?	
41	Has the design been elaborated in baseline diagrams to a sufficient level of detail?	
42	Were the following drivers specified: performance, reliability, hardware, memory considerations, and programming languages?	
43	Was the test strategy/plan discussed, including test environments, test data, and tools?	
44	Were simulators discussed?	
45	Were the results from the Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA), as they pertain to software, presented?	
46	Were Configuration Management (CM) and Product Assurance tools discussed to a sufficient level of detail?	
47	Is there evidence that software change control procedures are in place and being implemented as specified in the CM Plan?	
48	Is there evidence that software quality procedures are being implemented as specified in the SQ plan?	
49	Were development tools identified and discussed to a sufficient level of detail?	
50	Was measurement data collection and proposed metrics presented?	

Revision: 2.0 Page 4 of 7

SOFT	WARE DOCUMENTATION STATUS	
51	Does the review package address the	
	status of the following	
	documentation:	
51a	Software Management Plan	
51b	Software Requirements Document	
51c	Risk Management Plan	
51d	Software Test Plan	
51e	Interface Control Document(s)	
51f	Software Configuration	
	Management Plan	
51g	Software Quality Assurance Plan	
51h	IV&V MOA and Project Plan	
51i	Current Development Schedule,	
	with milestones, deliverables, and	
	dependencies	
51j	Build/Release Plan and contents	
51k	Preliminary Design Document?	
POST	REVIEW ACTIVITIES	
	At the conclusion of the review is a	
	technical understanding reached on	
	the validity and degree of	
52	completeness of:	
52	<ul><li>System/subsystem</li></ul>	
	specification?	
	<ul> <li>The engineering design/cost</li> </ul>	
	of the system?	
53	Did all designated stakeholders	
	concur in the acceptability of the	
	PDR?	
54	Is there a process in place for	
	reviewing and tracking the closure	
	of risks, issues, or RFAs?	
55	Are there any risks, issues, or	
	request for actions (RFAs) that	
	require follow-up?	
56	Have all artifacts been placed under	
	formal configuration control (e.g.,	
	review packages)?	
57	Were Lessons Learned addressed	
	and captured?	

Revision: 2.0 Page 5 of 7

### REFERENCE ITEMS/DOCUMENTS

ISD Checklist 580-CK-007-01, Contents of the Software Preliminary Design Review (PDR)

BK Draft PDR Guidelines, GSFC System Management Office, Design Review Guidelines - PDR

Revision: 2.0 Page 6 of 7

Assessor(s):	:: Project: Review Examined:
COMMENTS PAGE	of
# Comments fro	m assessment

Revision: 2.0 Page 7 of 7